

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/058,170 04/10/98 BLEIZEFFER

T ST9-97-130/C

SLIGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS
1010 EL CAMINO REAL
SUITE 360
MENLO PARK CA 94025

WM02/1019

EXAMINER

THAI, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173
DATE MAILED:

10/19/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/058,170	TERRY M. BLEIZEFFER ET AL.
Examiner CUONG T. THAI	Group Art Unit 2173

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8eft /27 /01 AMENDMENT.
 This action is **FINAL**.
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 Claim(s) 1-6 , 11-18 , 23 -30 , 35 -42 AND 47-48 is/are rejected.
 Claim(s) 7-10 , 19-22 , 31-34 , AND 43 -46 is/are objected to.
 Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
 The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
 The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
 The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413
 Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Serial Number: 09/058,170

-2-

Art Unit: 2173

DETAIL ACTION

Specification

1. Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.
2. This Office Action is correponds to Amendment filed on Sept., 27, 2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2173

art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 11-13, 23-25, 35-37 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benton et al. (USPN: 5,675,756) hereinafter Benton in view of Paterson et al. (USPN: 6,069,629) hereinafter Paterson.

As per claims 1(method), 13(system), 25(computer program), and 37(computer-readable); Benton teaches a method substantially as claimed. Benton discloses a method for leading a user through a program procedure on a computer to accomplish at least one of loading, installation, migration, fallback, remigration, and updated tasks of a program as the technique of represents process graphic editing within an MCUI 300 for creating and modifying the system and application database 100, 130, respectively. The user 80 can direct the processor portion 50 in Fig. 2 to pull the process graphic editor software into the processor 50 for use by the user 80. Thus in Fig. 4 represents the processor 50 with the process graphic 52 running. The process graphic editor 52 allows the user to create, modify, and delete graphic display files 134. When the graphic display editor 52 is running, information within the system and application database 100, 130 can be accessed and changed(see column 7, lines 47-57), a method comprises:

displaying a window to the user providing information regarding parameters of the program is taught by Benton as the technique of a network control system includes graphical representations of actual devices coupled to a network. The graphical representations includes symbols that provide an actual picture of the devices and means for displaying values and status of the devices(see abstract). Benton's system teaches the PC based Streamline automation product should be installed into a 486, or higher microprocessor based PC (Monitoring/Control User Interface- MCUI 300, Fig.2) (see column 5, lines 30-33). A mixing tank is well known in the art to have several physical parameters 32, 34, 36, 38 associated with it. In particular, a mixing tank usually has a level parameter, an analog mixing control parameter, a digital mixing control parameter, a pressure parameter, a speed parameter, and a temperature parameter (see column 6, lines 41-46).

Benton, however, doesn't disclose the limitation of transferring the user from the window to a parameter input window associated with one of the parameters selected by the user to be set or changed, wherein the user provides information in the parameter input window to set or changes the value of the parameter, the parameter input window being the only location where the parameters need to be set or changed.

Art Unit: 2173

Paterson discloses the limitation of transferring the user from the window to a parameter input window associated with one of the parameters selected by the user to be set or changed, wherein the user provides information in the parameter input window to set or changes the value of the parameter, the parameter input window being the only location where the parameters need to be set or changed as the technique of a method for providing access to object parameters of a simulation model involves the display of a diagram panel within a user interface. An access panel is also displayed within the user interface, this access panel being distinct and apart from the diagram panel. A set of object parameters, in term of which objects within the simulation model may be defined, are identified for inclusion and display within the access panel. In response to identification of the set of object parameters, an identifier for each parameter of the set is displayed within the access panel. A value for at least one of the object parameters is then inputted by a user via the access panel (see abstract). Paterson's invention further include the setting section 96 includes three values for the relevant parameter, namely a working value, a baseline value and a comparison value....The working value will be updated accordingly (see column 5 lines 41-48) and as a simulation operation using the simulation model 150 proceed, the working value displayed within the working value column 268 for each

Art Unit: 2173

parameter may change and continually be updated (see column 14 lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the limitation of transferring the user from the window to a parameter input window associated with one of the parameters selected by the user to be set or changed, wherein the user provides information in the parameter input window to set or changes the value of the parameter, the parameter input window being the only location where the parameters need to be set or changed by Paterson for that of Benton's invention. By doing so, the system would provide better edit tools for accessing to object parameter control interface to end users.

As per claims 11(method), 23(system), 35(computer program), and 47(computer-readable); Benton discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Benton, however, does not disclose the limitation of preventing the user from selecting to set or change a value of the parameter for at least one of the parameter.

Paterson discloses the limitation of preventing the user from selecting to set or change a value of the parameter for at least one of the parameter as the technique of using button CANCEL to prevent user from set or change parameter (see Fig.5)

Art Unit: 2173

and the baseline value is specified by the original builder of a simulation model in which the relevant parameter is utilized, and can not be modified directly by a user(see column 5 lines 49-52).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the limitation of preventing the user from selecting to set or change a value of the parameter for at least one of the parameter by Paterson for that of Benton's invention. By doing so, the system would provide better tools to end user in order to insure the system work properly based on user's desired manner.

As per claims 12(method), 24(system), 36(computer program), and 48(computer-readable); the limitation of wherein a parameter must be modified is taught by Benton as the technique of represents process graphic editing within an MCUI 300 for creating and modifying the system and application database 100, 130, respectively. The user 80 can direct the processor portion 50 in Fig. 2 to pull the process graphic editor software into the processor 50 for use by the user 80. Thus in Fig. 4 represents the processor 50 with the process graphic 52 running. The process graphic editor 52 allows the user to create, modify, and delete graphic display files 134. When the graphic display editor 52 is running, information within the system and application database 100, 130 can be accessed and changed(see column 7, lines 47-57).

Art Unit: 2173

These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

5. Claims 2-6, 14-18, 26-30 and 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benton et al. (USPN: 5,675,756) hereinafter Benton in view of Paterson et al. (USPN: 6,069,629) hereinafter Paterson and further in view of Massaro et al. (USPN: 5,535,321) hereinafter Massaro.

As per claims 2(method), 14(system), 26(computer program), and 38(computer-readable); Benton-Paterson disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Benton-Paterson, however, do not disclose the limitation of prior displaying a window to the user, the user is provided with at least two interaction path options, a first one of the interaction path option being a non-expert path and a second one of the interaction path option being an expert path.

Massaro discloses the limitation of the user is provided with at least two interaction path options, a first one of the interaction path option being a non-expert path and a second one of the interaction path option being an expert path as the technique of multiple user interfaces are established for selected functions within a multiple function application. Each of the multiple user interfaces preferably has a different level

Art Unit: 2173

of complexity. User profiles for selected users within the data processing system are then utilized to specify desired level of complexity for particular functions for each selected user(see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the limitation of the user is provided with at least two interaction path options, a first one of the interaction path option being a non-expert path and a second one of the interaction path option being an expert path by Massaro into that of Benton-Paterson's combined invention. By doing so, the system would enhance by supplying users with both expert and non-expert paths with based on user's skill level.

As per claims 3(method), 15(system), 27(computer program), and 39(computer-readable); Benton-Paterson disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Paterson discloses the limitation of the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program as the technique of a method for providing access to object parameters of a simulation model involves the display of a diagram panel within a user interface. An access panel is also displayed within the user interface, this access panel being distinct and apart from the diagram panel. A set of object parameters, in term of which objects within the

Art Unit: 2173

simulation model may be defined, are identified for inclusion and display within the access panel (see abstract). Benton-Paterson, however, do not disclose the limitation of a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path options, a first one being a non-expert path option and a second one being an expert path option.

Massaro discloses the limitation of choice windowis display to the user as the technique of assistance level window 26 is utilized, in accordance with the method and apparatus of the present invention, to permit a user to identify the current level of assistance, or complexity specified for the function identified within function identifier...., a desired level of complexity for the function identified within function identifier 24 (see column 3 line 64 to column 4 line 7 and also see Fig. 3). Massaro further discloses the user is provided with at least two interaction path options, a first one of the interaction path option being a non-expert path and a second one of the interaction path option being an expert path as the technique of multiple user interfaces are established for selected functions within a multiple function application. Each of the multiple user interfaces preferably has a different level of complexity. User profiles for selected users within the data processing system are

Art Unit: 2173

then utilized to specify desired level of complexity for particular functions for each selected user(see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the limitation of choice windowis display to the user and the user is provided with at least two interaction path options, a first one of the interaction path option being a non-expert path and a second one of the interaction path option being an expert path by Massaro into that of Benton-Paterson's combined invention. By doing so, the system would enhance by supplying users choice/selection window wherein the user can selects window on his/her own manner based on both expert and non-expert paths of his/her's own skill level.

As per claims 4(method), 16(system), 28(computer program), and 40(computer-readable); Benton-Paterson disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Paterson discloses the limitation of displaying another information window providing information regarding to another parameter of the program as the technique of each of the layers 304-308 has a respecttive layer panel 310-314 associated therewith, which allows a modeler to construct the respective layer and to then view the values attributed to the various parameters which are included in the associated layer. Each of the layer 310-314 is similar in appearance and layout to

Art Unit: 2173

the access panels shown in Fig. 13, but the propose and functioning of the layer panels are fundamentally different form that of the access panels(see column 16 lines 13-21 and see Fig. 3). These claims are therefore rejected for the reason as set forth aboved.

As per claims 5(method), 17(system), 29(computer program), and 41(computer-readable); due to the similarity of each of these claims to the combination of claims 3-4, 15-16, 27-28, and 39-40; respectively; these claims are therefore rejected for the same reasons applied to claims 3-4, 15-16, 27-28, and 39-40.

As per claims 6(method), 18(system), 30(computer program), and 42(computer-readable); Benton-Paterson disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Paterson discloses the limitation of wherein the step of displaying another information window comprising returning the user from the parameter input window to the information window associated with the parameter selected to be set or changed by the user and then forwarding the user to the another information window is taught by Parterson as the technique of each of monitor panels 380 and 382 further includes both X and Y parameter identifiers 388 and 390 which identify the respective X and Y input parameters for the plotted transform and also display current numeric values for each of these parameters

Art Unit: 2173

at any given time. A monitor line 392 is also provided within each of these the monitor panels 380 and 382, and identifies the X input parameter value within the plotted a transform. Monitor panels may be used in conjunction with a further chart panel, as discussed below with the reference to Figs. 20a and 20b to monitor the interaction of various parameters in a graphical manner(see column 18, lines 19-30). These claims are therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 7-10, 19-22, 31-34, and 43-46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The examiner has carefully considered each of the three dependent claims 8-10. Claims 20-22, 32-34, and 44-46 are treated as claims 8-10; except system, computer program and computer readable medium instead of method claim. The Examiner also carefully reconsidered each of the four dependent claims 7, 19,

Art Unit: 2173

31, and 43 drawn to the limitation of when the user has selected the expert path, window list any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user(see claims 7, 19, 31 or 43).

The prior arts of record fail to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. Specially, the prior arts fail to teach, in combination with the remaining limitation of wherein prior displaying a window to the user, a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program, wherein, when the user has selected the expert path, the window listing any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user and further after the user provides the information in the parameter input window, returning the user to the expert window(see claims 8, 20, 32, and 44). The prior arts of record further fail to disclose the limitation of displaying a window to the user, a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the

Art Unit: 2173

user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program, wherein, when the user has selected the expert path, the window listing any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user and further repeating step of a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program for each of the parameters selected by the user from the expert window when the user has selected the expert path(see claims 9, 21, 33, and 45). Moreover, the prior arts of record fail to make obvious of displaying a window to the user, a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program, wherein, when the user has selected the expert path, the window listing any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user and further after step of when the user has selected the non-

Art Unit: 2173

expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding parameter of the program, transferring the user from the parameter input window to the information window associated with the parameter, thereby allowing the user to view the information regarding the parameter, and returning the user to the parameter input window(see claims 10, 22, 34, and 46).

Riley (USPN: 5,896,138), Cousins et al. (USPN:5,673,404), Paterson et al. (USPN: 6,069,629), Lane et al. (Uspn: 4,873,623), and Benton et al. (USPN:5,675,756) are teaching for defining, accessing, editting, re-editting, linking, updating parameter(s)/attribute(s) in window environment. But, none of them teaching any of the below:

wherein prior displaying a window to the user, a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program, wherein, when the user has selected the expert path, the window listing any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user and further after the user provides the information in the parameter input window, returning the user to

Art Unit: 2173

the expert window. Displaying a window to the user, a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program, wherein, when the user has selected the expert path, the window listing any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user and further repeating step of a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a parameter of the program for each of the parameters selected by the user from the expert window when the user has selected the expert path. Displaying a window to the user, a choice window is displayed to the user, wherein the user is provided with at least two interaction path option, a first one of the interaction path being a non-expert and a second one of the interaction being an expert path and wherein, when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding a

Art Unit: 2173

parameter of the program, wherein, when the user has selected the expert path, the window listing any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user and further after step of when the user has selected the non-expert path, the window is an information window providing information regarding parameter of the program, transferring the user from the parameter input window to the information window associated with the parameter, thereby allowing the user to view the information regarding the parameter, and returning the user to the parameter input window. OR when the user has selected the expert path, window list any of the parameters of the program which may be modified by the user.

8. Applicants' argument filed on Sept 27 2001 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicants Amend that claims 1, 13, 25 and 37 include for leading a user through a program procedure on a computer to accomplish at least one of loading, installation, migration, fallback, remigration, and updated tasks of a program, However, this computer to accomplish at least one of loading, installation, migration, fallback, remigration, and updated tasks of a program is taught by Benton as the technique of represents process graphic editing within an MCUI 300 for creating and modifying the system and application database 100, 130,

Art Unit: 2173

respectively. The user 80 can direct the processor portion 50 in Fig. 2 to pull the process graphic editor software into the processor 50 for use by the user 80. Thus in Fig. 4 represents the processor 50 with the process graphic 52 running. The process graphic editor 52 allows the user to create, modify, and delete graphic display files 134. When the graphic display editor 52 is running, information within the system and application database 100, 130 can be accessed and changed(see column 7, lines 47-57). Therefore claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are remain rejected for the reason as set forth aboved.

9. Applicants' arguments filed on April 17 2001 have been fully reconsidered.

On the last paragraph of page 7, Applicants argue that Bleizeffer is not the prior art to the present application. Examiner do agree to this argument and therefore the rejections based on Bleizeffer has been withdrawn.

On pages 8-10, with respect to claims 1, 13, 25, and 37, Applicants argue that independent claims recite the setting or changing of parameter values. Examiner have indicated that Paterson discloses this limitation of setting or changing of parameter values as the technique of an access panel is also displayed within the user interface, this access panel being

Art Unit: 2173

distinct and apart from the diagram panel. A set of object parameters, in term of which objects within the simulation model may be defined, are identified for inclusion and display within the access panel. In response to identification of the set of object parameters, an identifier for each parameter of the set is displayed within the access panel. A value for at least one of the object parameters is then inputted by a user via the access panel (see abstract) not graphical representation of the parameter as indicated by Applicants.

And on the first paragraph of page 10, Applicants argue that Massano does not supply any deficiencies of Benton and Paterson. Assuming arguendo that Massano teaches what the Examiner says it does, Massano still lacks teaching or suggestion of change of parameters. Examiner do not agree on this argument because Massano has been used as prior art which applied for rejections on another sets of claims(i.e. claims 2-6, 14-18, 26-30 and 38-42) but not independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 37.

On the second paragraph of page 10, Applicants indicated that For these reasons, even if one of ordinary skill in the art could made..... Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 37, and their respective dependencies, are patentable. Examiner, however, do not agree to this argument. These claim are remain rejected for the reason below:

Paterson discloses this limitation of setting or changing of parameter values as the technique of an access panel is also displayed within the user interface, this access panel being distinct and apart from the diagram panel. A set of object parameters, in term of which objects within the simulation model may be defined, are identified for inclusion and display within the access panel. In response to identification of the set of object parameters, an identifier for each parameter of the set is displayed within the access panel. A value for at least one of the object parameters is then inputted by a user via the access panel (see abstract). Paterson's invention further include the setting section 96 includes three values for the relevant parameter, namely a working value, a baseline value and a comparison value....The working value will be updated accordingly (see column 5 lines 41-48) and as a simulation operation using the simulation model 150 proceed, the working value displayed within the working value column 268 for each parameter may change and continually be updated (see column 14 lines 1-4).

On the fourth and fifth paragraphs of page 10, with respect to claims 11, 23, 35 and 47; Applicants argue that ~~to~~ Dependent claims 11, 23, 35, and 47 recite a feature that provides a step of preventing the user from selecting ~~to set or change~~ a value

Art Unit: 2173

of the parameter. The Examiner assert that Paterson disclose this claim feature by providing the technique of using a cancel button....whereas the claims at issue specifically recite that the user is prevented from setting or changing the parameter. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, dependent claims 11, 23, 35, and 47 are patentable *. Examiner, however, do believe the baseline value is specified by the origional builder of a simulation model in which the relevent parameter is utilized, and can not be modified directly by a user. This baseline which can not modified directly by the user certainly preventing the user from setting or changing. These claims are therefore remain rejected for the reason as set forth aboved.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expired THREE (3) months, ZERO days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to be abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133.

Art Unit: 2173

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cuong T. Thai whose telephone number is 703-308-7234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Serial Number: 09/058,170

-24-

Art Unit: 2173

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CTT.

October 18, 2001



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173